

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending, Claims 1-30 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 3-7 and 13-17 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, and Claims 1-30 were rejected as being anticipated by Wada et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,618).

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the courtesy extended by Examiner Sefcheck and Examiner Kizou by holding an interview with the undersigned on April 20, 2005. During the interview, it was agreed that the claims were discussed regarding their clarity and differences over the prior art. The substance of what was discussed in the interview is reflected in the remarks that follow.

Claims 1-30 have been amended to comply with 35 USC §112, second paragraph. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified. During the interview, the Examiner explained that he found the language of the claims to be confusing, especially referring to the claimed relationships between different stations. It is believed that the claims as presently drafted are clear, and patentably define over the asserted prior art, as will be discussed.

By way of example, Claim 1 is directed to a packet communication method having a transmission-source address and a destination address. The method includes steps of (a) making a predetermined number of bits of the transmission-source address and of the destination address be predetermined "address portions". The method then includes a step (b) of sending the packet from a "transmission-source terminal" to a "source-side repeating

node” and then at the source-side repeating node, converting the predetermined address into an address of a higher-ranked station for the source-side repeating node. Subsequently, in step (c) the source-side repeating node converts the predetermined address portion of the destination address into an address of a higher-ranked station of a last destination-side repeating node for destination terminal and transfers the packet.

In a non-limiting example, Claim 1 will be used to show how it covers Figure 4. As seen in the left-hand side of Figure 4, an initial packet having a destination portion (D) and a source portion (S), where the respective address portions are N00 in both the destination portion and source portion.

Then the packet is sent (a sending step B in Claim 1) to a source-side repeating node (which is mobile station 4 in Figure 4) and then the predetermined address portion of the transmission-source address is converted into an address of a higher-ranked station for the source side repeating node (e.g., converting N00 in the source portion of the address to B01, which is the base station ID of base-station 50, which serves as a higher-ranked station for the source-side repeating node 40). In step C, the source-side repeating node (mobile station 40 in Figure 4) converts the predetermined address portion of the destination address N00 in the original packet to B02 (which corresponds to base station 51, the address of the higher-ranked station of the last destination-side repeating node (i.e., mobile station 41 in Figure 4)).

Although the non-limiting example given above is provided to help illustrate how the language corresponds with the figures, it is acknowledged that the claims should not be so limited to cover only the illustrated figures. Nevertheless, as requested by the Examiner during the interview, the redrafting of all of the pending claims, using this particular format has been done so that the Examiner can better understand the flow of the packets between the different respective stations and terminals as illustrated in the patent application.

As discussed during the interview, it is respectfully submitted that Wada is directed to a completely different system that employs either the use of broadcast messages, or migration host messages, but otherwise, does not correspond with any of Claims 1-30.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-30 as amended, is patently distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
BDL:smi

I:\ATTY\BDL\201166US\201166US-AM2.DOC